



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/055,240 | 01/23/2002 | Steve Carleton | 3146.00004 | 8347 |

7590 07/28/2004
Amy E. Rinaldo
Kohn & Associates
Suite 410
30500 Northwestern Highway
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

EXAMINER

KRAMER, JAMES A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,240

Applicant(s)

CARLETON, STEVE

Examiner

James A. Kramer

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 14 recite the limitation "personal information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically it is unclear where this information comes from and what purpose it serves. As result the claims are rendered unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lohrey et al. (hereinafter Lohrey).

Lohrey teaches an automatic customer interface for services involving drop-off and pickup. Referencing Figure 1, Lohrey teaches a kiosk style customer interface facility (10) with customer interface panel and a storage facility (securing means). Within the customer interface facility is a general computer networked (communication means) with a central computer at a central processing plant (service station) (e.g. column 2; lines 63-68).

Art Unit: 3627

Referencing the preferred embodiment of Figure 4A, the kiosk style customer interface facility (10) contains an information processing system (78) which selectively directs information to the Vendor (72) and the electronic debiting system (74). Examiner notes that the information processing system represents Applicant's communication means, the vendor represents the service station and the electronic debiting system represents the management station.

Lohrey teaches that the system of the invention is activated by a general purpose credit card (swipe and scan technology) (e.g. column 2; lines 39-42) and that older systems are known to accept tokens (e.g. column 1; lines 45-47). These features serve to bill the customer for services rendered (e.g. column 2; lines 50-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohrey et al. (hereinafter Lohrey) in view of Applicant's disclosure.

Lohrey as disclosed in depth above, does not specifically teach that the central processing plant is a mobile vehicle service station. Lohrey does teach the system can be used for any service which involves both the drop-off and pickup of items by a customer (column 5; lines 37-39). Applicant discloses as old and well known in the art mobile servicing facilities (page 2 of the specification). This disclosure makes it clear that a customer must drop-off and pick up a vehicle in order to have it serviced by one of the

Art Unit: 3627

prior art mobile servicing facilities. As such It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Lohrey to include a mobile servicing facility in order to provide customers with an automated, attendant free customer interface.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohrey et al. (hereinafter Lohrey) in view of Admitted Prior Art.

Lohrey as disclosed in depth above, does not specifically teach color coded parts for indicating service has occurred. The common knowledge or well-known in the art statement made by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed 12/18/03 is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of Official Notice or the traverse was inadequate (MPEP2144.03(C)). It is therefore admitted as Prior Art that it is old and well known in the art for service business to use color-coded systems to indication different levels of work completed as a means of quickly identifying items within a process. Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system or Lohrey to included a color-coded system (i.e. different color bags for dirty laundry versus clean laundry) in order to quickly identify the state of an item within the process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that the amendments made to the independent claims overcome all grounds for rejection as discussed in the Interview conducted on March 25, 2004. Specifically, that Lohrey fails to teach a processing means capable of

Art Unit: 3627

communicating service and personal information to different locations. Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to the Information processing system (78) of figure 4A. The Information Processing System clearly sends one set of information to the vendor and another set of information to the electronic debiting system. This represents a processing means capable of communicating service and personal information to different locations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Kramer whose telephone number is (703) 305-5241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8AM - 5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (703) 305-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Kramer
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

JAK

Richard Clifcoat
Technology Patent Examiner
Technology Center
3627